DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 687 UD 021 669

AUTHOR McCullough, Wayne R.; And Others
TITLE Racial Identity and Consciousness: The Socialization of Ingroup and Outgroup Orientations.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Psychological Association (Los Angeles, CA, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Blacks; Ethnicity; Group Dynamics; *Intergroup Relations; Parent Role; *Political Socialization; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Identification; Self Concept
IDENTIFIERS National Survey of Black Americans

ABSTRACT

The relationship that minority group members, specifically blacks, have with their racial group has received broad attention. Some literature has focused upon effects of minority status or membership while other work has focused upon either the transformation to a positive social identity or the development of collective commitments to redress societal inequalities. The purpose of the present paper is to draw from data collected in the National Survey of Black Americans in order to explore the nature of and interrelationships among ingroup and intergroup orientations and, particularly, whether collective commitments to the ingroup derive more from ingroup or intergroup aspects of identity. A secondary issue addressed is the relationship of socialization messages to the development of ingroup and outgroup orientations. The analyses suggest that ingroup and outgroup orientations are separate components of identity and that they have different implications for the development of political consciousness. Results of the analyses on the impact of parental socialization messages indicate that ingroup and outgroup socialization messages are differentially related to the various types and patterns of identification and consciousness. These findings have numerous implications for the socialization of group identification, ingroup and outgroup orientations, and political consciousness. (Author/JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212687

Racial Identity and Consciousness:
The Socialization of Ingroup and Outgroup Orientations

Wayne R. McCullough, Gerald Gurin
and James S. Jackson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WAYNE R. McCULLOUGH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the 1981 meetings of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Calafornia

UD021669

RACIAL IDENTITY AND CONSCIOUSNESS: THE SOCIALIZATION OF INGROUP AND OUTGROUP ORIENTATIONS

In the literature on group identity, there has been some interest in exploring the possible interdependence between identification with the ingroup and attitudes toward the outgroup. Controversy exists over the relationship between "ingroup favoritism" and "outgroup dislike." These ingroup and outgroup attitudes are presumed by some to be inversely related even when there has been little intergroup contact (Sherif, 1953). On the other hand, others have found that ingroup bias does not necessarily lead toward outgroup antagonism (Wilson & Kayatani, 1968; Dion, 1973). More recent studies have sought to make the development of positive bias toward the ingroup dependent to some degree on the level of disaffection with the outgroup. Others propose that ingroup cohesion and outgroup attitudes are linked under conditions of high external threat (Holmes, 1975, as reported in Dion, 1979).

Because so much of the prior work has focused on ingroup/outgroup attitudes in typically controlled settings, the relationship for "natural" groups in the social environment is unclear. The investigation we will report on today, therefore, examines the relationship between ingroup affiliation and outgroup orientations in such a natural setting--the group identifications and intergroup attitudes of a representative national sample of American Blacks. Prior research has also been limited in that it has focused almost exclusively on the relationship between ingroup and

outgroup orientations; in this paper, we will view both intra-group and inter-group orientations as aspects of group identity and explore some of their determinants and consequences.

Specifically, this paper has three aims:

1) to examine the extent to which Black identity includes both ingroup and intergroup elements;

2) to explore the implications of both these aspects of identity for the political mobilization of Black Americans--particularly whether collective commitments derive more from ingroup or intergroup aspects of identity; and,

3) to explore the antecedents of these two aspects of identity in the socialization messages imparted by parents on what it means to be black and how to deal with the white world.

The National Survey of Black Americans

The current investigation uses data from the National Survey of Black Americans (NSBA) conducted by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. It is the first cross-section survey of an area probability sample of the adult Black population living in the continental United States. The sample design allowed for the national representation of all non-institutionalized Black Americans over the age of 18. The multi-stage, area probability, sampling procedure drew 76 primary interviewing locations spread throughout the country. The Black interviewing staff conducted face-to-face interviews with 2107 Black

respondents, averaging approximately 2 1/2 hours per interview.

Although the study had a primary emphasis upon mental health and identity issues, it covered a broad range of other content areas. The questionnaires were designed to capture perceptions of neighborhood, the importance of religion, health and personal problems, employment status and histories, family and friendship relations and networks, utilization of social support and mental health resources.

The Measures

The measures of ingroup orientations in this study followed the approach of other studies on group identification that have been done at the Institute of Social Research. In those studies the major measure of identification has been one which asked respondents their feelings of "closeness" to the group, with closeness defined in terms of similarity to other group members in ideas and feelings about things. Previous work at ISR as well as our pretests suggested that such a question would get little variance if asked about Blacks as a group--almost all Blacks feel identified as measured in this way. In the present study, therefore, the measure of closeness was applied to non-American Black groups since we felt this would provide a more differentiated measure of the respondent's identification with Blacks. Specifically, respondents were asked how close they felt to West Indians and how close they felt to Black people in Africa, with the responses combined

into an index of the respondents' identification as Black.

There were two central measures of intergroup orientations. One was directed toward the respondent's actual intergroup behavior. Respondents were asked: "Do you know any white person who you think of as a good friend--that is, someone to whom you can say what you really think?" A second measure tapped a broader cognitive orientation toward intergroup relations; it asked the respondents: "-- do you think most white people want to see Blacks get a better break, or do they want to keep Blacks down or don't they care one way or the other?" Thus, positive intergroup orientations were measured by having a close white friend, and by the perception that white people are generally supportive of Black people's interests.

Two other questions in the questionnaire had elements of both inter-group and ingroup orientations. These questions presented a choice between ingroup and outgroup identifications. One question asked: "Who do you feel closer to--Black people in Africa or white people in America?" The other question phrased the outgroup less specifically as "whites" and more generally as "Americans"; it asked: "Which would you say is more important to you--being Black or being American, or are both equally important to you?"

In conceptualizing the political mobilization of identity, we have focused on the two concepts mentioned in the preceding papers, which have been central in the work on

group consciousness of all of us at the Institute for Social Research: system blame and colective orientations. For groups of lower status and power in a society, one central element in the development of political group consciousness is the adherence to an ideology of system blame--i.e., that the causes of the group's lower status lie in the system rather than the defects of the individual group members. A second critical element in the politicalization of group consciousness is that group members see collective group action rather than individual mobility as the means of redressing their lower power position. In this study, system blame was measured by two forced choice questions which counterposed individual and systemic explanations for Blacks' lower status in America. Collective orientation was measured by two different questions. The first counterposed collective and individual action as the way for Blacks to improve their position in American. The second, asked respondents whether they felt what happened to them depends more on what happens to Blacks as a group or what they did themselves.

Results

These seven items and indices were factor analyzed. We restricted the analysis to a two factor solution to see whether we got the expected distinction between ingroup and outgroup orientations, and how the political mobilization measures loaded on these two factors. The results of the factor analysis appear in Table 1. Both factors are strong,

each explaining the same proportion of the total variance.

As indicated in the Table, the two main measures of intergroup orientations--whether the respondent has a close white friend, and whether white people are seen as supportive of Blacks--have the largest loadings on one factor; and the ingroup measure of feelings of closeness to non-American Blacks has the largest loading on the second factor. Moreover, the other four measures load in opposite ways on these two factors. Having a white friend and seeing whites as supportive goes with identifying as American and with white Americans, viewing the causes of Blacks' lower status as individually rather than systemically determined, and advocating individual rather than collective action. Feeling close to non-American Blacks goes with choosing Black and Black African identifications over American and white American ones, and with belief in system blame and collective action. Moreover, the loadings on these two factors tend to be very different, suggesting further implications of the distinction between ingroup and inter-group orientations among American Blacks.

The question which forced a choice of identification between being Black or being American loads fairly equally on both, although slightly more on the inter-group orientation factor. However, the other question which forced a choice between ingroup and inter-group identifications--Blacks in Africa or Whites in America--loads on the ingroup factor. This question apparently

captures the respondent's world-wide identification as Black, more than the rejection of white Americans.

It is also interesting that the two measures on the development of group identification into political consciousness load differently on the two factors. System blame has a fairly high negative loading on the inter-group factor, indicating a common thread in inter-group orientations that ties reactions to whites at the personal friendship level to ideological views of the system where whites have exercised control--having a white friend goes with individual rather than system blame. Collective orientations, on the other hand, which measure the sense of common fate and the need to act collectively, loads primarily on the ingroup orientation factor. The preceding paper on gender identity has noted that, in women, identification as a woman does not necessarily imply commitment to collective action; it does so only when that identification has become politicized ideologically. Among Blacks, as some of our previous research at ISR has suggested (Gurin, Miller & Gurin, 1980), identification as Black at this stage of our history in America, automatically implies some sense of common fate and collective commitment.

To summarize, the data suggest that the measures of ingroup and outgroup orientations are separate components of identity, and that, for American Blacks, they have different implications for the development of group political consciousness.

One final point is relevant. While ingroup and outgroup orientations are clearly separate, the question remains on the nature of their relationship. We noted at the beginning of this paper that controversy exists in the literature on whether or not positive identification with the ingroup necessarily involves at least some degree of antagonism toward the outgroup. We would expect some such negative relationship to exist in any group which, like American Blacks, has suffered a long history of discrimination and limited power. In such low power groups we would expect that positive orientations toward their own group would be related to negative orientations toward the group that exercised the power and constraints.

This expectation is not supported in our data when we look at the correlation between the ingroup identification measure on closeness to non-American Blacks, and the question on whether or not the respondent has a close white friendship. There is only a correlation of .03 between positive identification with non-American Blacks and not having any close white friend. The correlation does increase somewhat, however, as one moves from the interpersonal to ideological expression of inter-group orientations. Thus, there is a correlation of .08 between positive identification with non-American Blacks and feeling that whites want to keep Blacks down, and a correlation of .13 (low but significant) between positive identification with non-American Blacks and feeling that the system, not

individual Blacks, is to blame for the condition of Blacks in America. Thus, for American Blacks, positive ingroup orientations do not seem to imply rejection of the outgroup on the personal level, but do imply some outgroup antagonism on the ideological level.

The Development of Ingroup and Outgroup Orientations

Having determined the non-independence of the broad measures of ingroup and outgroup orientations, we now address the issue of how individuals may be influenced to arrive at these particular orientations via parental socialization. The literature on political socialization strongly suggests that there is high correspondence between parents' and childrens' political orientations and attitudes toward the system (Jennings & Niemi, 1968; Pitts, 1975). This literature and the press of the larger society upon minority group members leads us to believe there may be a substantial impact of these parental messages upon the individual's ingroup and outgroup orientations.

Lipscomb (1975) in a study of socialization practices of mothers of five and six year-old children hypothesized that the mother's background characteristics (education, income) affect mothers' attitudes (attitudes toward the system) which, in turn, affect the socialization practices they employ in rearing their children. She further hypothesized there to be a direct effect of socialization practices upon the childrens' ingroup orientation. A causal analysis supported this socialization sequence. Although

her measures of ingroup and outgroup orientations are not directly comparable to the measures here, they were ascriptions of positive and negative stereotypes to ingroup and outgroup members by the children.

The current study, although just presenting preliminary data, also proposes a model comparable in many respects to that proposed by Lipscomb (1975).

To assess the impact which socialization practices may have had on the development of ingroup and outgroup orientations, our respondents were asked two major questions relative to the socialization they received. As in our identification measures, our socialization measures separated socialization practices relevant to ingroup and inter-group orientations. The first question asked "What did your parents or the people who raised you teach you to help you know what it is to be Black?" The second asked, "What did your family teach you about how to get along with White people?" The open-ended responses for each of these questions were categorized into one of six response categories: nothing-those who noted receiving no message relative to the question; individually-focused-messages which have little or no emphasis upon the individual's connection to the racial group and tend to stress coping with the living environment or individual achievement orientations in the educational and occupational arenas; positive group orientations which include messages which stress the non-inferiority of and the equality of Blacks

with all others, or specifically mention racial pride and the Black heritage; negative affect responses embody themes of fear and distrust of whites and negative messages about the racial group; acceptance responses reflect a lack of assertiveness with respect to whites and may stress the status of intergroup relations as acceptable, good, or changing for the better; challenge messages stress standing up for self and for group rights and the awareness of social structural blockages.

As indicated in Figure 1, the number of respondents mentioning these six different response categories varied for the two different socialization questions. As Figure 1 shows, sizeable proportions of the sample did not recall receiving any notable message from their parents on each of the two questions. Positive group and individual themes were the most prevalent messages for those told about what it means to be Black. Themes of acceptance and positive group orientations were those most often stressed on how to deal with whites.

Analyses of variance and subsequent pair-wise contrasts were computed to test for differential effects of socialization on each of the seven measures of group identification and consciousness. The socialization analyses at this point are very preliminary, but some findings and tentative conclusions might be briefly noted. unvaryingly, respondents not receiving any socialization message relative to what it means to be Black or how to deal

with whites were less identified with the group and significantly least likely to have white friends. The trend is also evidenced in the other associated indices of identification and consciousness.

The two socialization questions, designed to tap highly overlapping socialization practices, were initially thought to have similar outcomes. The socialization questions and their emergent themes, however, have somewhat different effects. Some socialization themes seem to lead to the development of pro-ingroup orientations while others seem to play a role in facilitating intergroup relations. These effects will be discussed separately.

What it means to be Black

In the development of ingroup identification we found the major difference is between those who received the acceptance socialization message, and those who were recipients of any of the remaining five. The two political consciousness measures (collective orientation and system blame) were similar in that those receiving no socialization messages were significantly least likely to be collectively oriented or system blaming than all other socialization orientations combined. One of the more distinguishing findings is the greater collective orientations which those socialized with positive group messages have in comparison with those socialized to an individual or even a challenge perspective. And, those receiving no socialization message were significantly less collective than those receiving

positive group or negative affect themes. Negative affect and challenge orientations lead to significantly more system blaming than no message.

The measures of intergroup attitudes (having a white friend and perceiving whites as wanting a better break for Blacks) have little internal differentiation by the particular messages received. Those socialized to individual, positive group, negative affect and acceptance and challenge messages are more likely to have a white friend than those with no socialization to Blackness. There were no socialization distinctions regarding the perceptions of whites wanting a better break for Blacks.

These particular socialization trends suggest several important considerations for the development of group identity, system blame and collective orientations. First, challenge and positive group orientations are most prominently implicated in the development of group identity and system blame orientations. The collective orientation is more strongly induced by the socialization to positive group and negative affect themes. Intergroup attitudes and interaction appear to be little influenced by socialization to "What it means to be Black."

How to Deal with Whites

This question appears to best differentiate those socialization themes which lead to better intergroup attitudes than the previous question did. As was evidenced with the prior question no reported socialization was the

least likely to result in "Having a White Friend". Unexpectedly, however, it was significantly less positive in this regard than either challenging, acceptance, or positive group themes. Those socialized with positive group themes were, in fact, significantly more likely to have a white friend than those who were socialized to individual or acceptance themes. For the perception that whites want a better break for Blacks, those socialized to positive group orientations were significantly more positive about whites' intergroup attitudes than those socialized to acceptance or no messages. And, also unexpectedly, this group was significantly more positive than even those reared to acceptance.

Although there were no overall effects, a few significant pairwise contrasts in two of the three ingroup or consciousness measures emerged. For collective orientation, those socialized to acceptance were significantly more collective than those receiving no messages. The most anomalous finding is that those socialized to positive group orientations with regard to how to deal with whites were significantly less system blaming than those raised with individual, acceptance or no messages.

Overall this question led to more differentiation in intergroup attitudes than those messages about socialization to Blackness. This pattern of results suggest that being socialized to challenge inequities somehow more fully

integrates one into the system and results in closer intergroup relations.

Summary/Conclusion

These data from the National Survey of Black Americans give some evidence that ingroup and outgroup orientations are inversely related. In exploring the degree to which parental socialization accounts for these ingroup and outgroup orientations, we have found they are not the result of a singular monolithic message, but rather, these orientations are derived from separate socialization messages, imparted and resulting in separate ends. The only differential thematic effects in socialization to what it means to be Black were found in only ingroup measures (except having a white friend where receiving any message produced more intergroup friendship than receiving nothing). Conversely, the only overall differential effects found for how to deal with whites were in the intergroup measures.

As a group, and almost without exception, those who report not receiving socialization messages relative to what it means to be Black or how to deal with whites are reflected in their relatively lowest ingroup and outgroup orientations.

As a group receiving socialization messages, those reared with themes of challenge and positive group orientations to blackness clearly exhibit the most positive profile vis-a-vis ingroup orientation. Those socialized to challenge are the most highly identified and most system

blaming group. Socialization to positive group orientations seems to produce the next highest level of group identification and the highest level of collective orientation. Unexpectedly, these same two themes, challenge and positive group orientations led to the highest levels of outgroup orientations. Those recipients of these themes were the most likely to report having close white friends and felt that whites wanted to see Blacks get a better break.

REFERENCES

Clark, K., & Clark, M. Skin color as a factor in racial identification of Negro pre-school children. Journal of Social Psychology, 1940, 11, 159-169.

Cross, W. E., Jr. Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. Black World, 1971, 20(9), 13-27.

Dion, K. L. Cohesiveness as a determinant of ingroup-outgroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28, 163-171.

Dion, K. L. Intergroup conflict and intragroup cohesiveness. In W. G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publising Co., 1979.

Grier, W. & Cobbs, D. Black rage. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Gurin, P., & Epps, E. Black consciousness, identity and acievement: A study of students in historically Black colleges. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Gurin, P., Miller, A. H., and Gurin, G. Stratum identification and consciousness. Social Psychology Quarterly, 1980, 43(1), 30-47.

Holmes, J. G. Group reactions to perceived threat. Research Grant Application to the Canada Council, 1975.

Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. The transmission of political values from parent to child. American Political Science Review, 1968, 62, 169-184.

Lipscomb, L. Socialization factors in the development of Black children's racial self-esteem. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, 1975.

Pitts, J. Self-direction and the political socialization of Black youth. Social Science Quarterly, 1975, 93-104.

Sherif, M. The concept of reference groups in human relations. In M. Sherif & M. O. Wilson (Eds.), Group relations at the crossroads. New York: Harper, 1953.

Tajfel, H. The psychological structure of intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. London: Academic Press, European Monographs in Social Psychology, 1978.

Wilson, W., & Kayatani, M. Intergroup attitudes and strategies in games between opponents of the same or a different race. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 24-30.

Table 1

Factor Analysis of Measures of Ingroup and Outgroup Orientations

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Has Close White Friend	.6449	.0948
Whites Support Black Interests	.7120	-.0273
Closeness to Non-American Blacks	.2269	.8007
Identification with Black Africans Vs White Americans	-.2231	.6905
Identification as Black Vs American	-.4212	.2785
System Blame	-.4966	.2034
Collective Orientations	-.1399	.4509
Percent Total Variance	20.97	20.71
Percent Common Variance	50.30	49.70

FIGURE 1: PROPORTION OF MESSAGES RECEIVED BY SOCIALIZATION QUEST.